



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,373	04/28/2000	Gregory Lucius Meredith	MS147248.1	3570

27195 7590 12/16/2005

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/560,373	MEREDITH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric B. Kiss	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eric B. Kiss. (3) Sunil Colaco.
 (2) James Pingor (Reg. No. 51,382). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 December 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,7 and 28.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:


- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Parties briefly discussed the rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner indicated that the language of claim 1, "written in XML" appeared to be most consistent with the specification, and amendments to claims 7 and 28, using the same language, may overcome the rejection, pending further review of Applicant's formal submission. Mr. Pingor asked what sort of Office action he could expect to receive if the Examiner makes a determination that the amendment does in fact overcome the only rejection presently of record. The Examiner indicated that while an amendment placing the application in condition for allowance may be entered after a final rejection, an updated search would then be required. Following the updated search, the most likely outcome would be either 1) a notice of allowability, or 2) a new Office action reopening prosecution with a new ground of rejection. The Examiner indicated that no official opinion of the pending allowability of the discussed claims would be given prior to receiving Applicant's formal amendment.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

PTOL-413A (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/560.373 First Named Applicant: Gregory Lucius Meredith
Examiner: Eric B. Kiss Art Unit: 2192 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Eric B. Kiss (2) James Pingor
(3) Sunil Colaco (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 12/05/2005 Proposed Time: 2 (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rejections</u>	<u>1-22</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Rejections</u>	<u>28-33</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Clarification of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 12/6/2005.
NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant's Representative Signature

James Pingor

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

51,382

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

EBK

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

LAW OFFICES

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER

1900 EAST NINTH STREET

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114

TELEPHONE: 216-696-8730

FACSIMILE: 216-696-8731

EMAIL: JPINGOR@THEPATENTATTORNEYS.COM

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY, AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ADDRESS LISTED BELOW VIA UNITED STATES MAIL. THANK YOU.

Date: December 1, 2005
TO: Eric B. Kiss – United States Patent and Trademark Office
FAX NO.: 571.273.3699
FROM: James J. Pingor

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Gregory Lucius Meredith, *et al.*

Examiner: Eric B. Kiss

Serial No: 09/560,373

Art Unit: 2192

Filing Date: April 28, 2000

Title: MODEL FOR BUSINESS WORKFLOW PROCESSES

NUMBER OF PAGES TO FOLLOW: 7

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY
Sak 12/6/2005

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

Dear Examiner Kiss:

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this matter – attached, please find proposed claim amendments in the above-referenced matter as well as the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (PTOL-413A (09-04)). I look forward to speaking with you on December 5, 2005, and to reaching agreement regarding these amendments. Thanks again for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

-Jamie.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Currently amended) A computer-implemented method for facilitating long-running transactions of a business workflow process, comprising:
 - reducing a business process to a ~~SLANG~~ scheduling programming language written in XML;
 - dividing the reduced business process into at least one independent transaction and at least one parent interdependent transaction, the at least one parent interdependent transaction comprises two or more child interdependent transactions;
 - executing the at least one independent transaction independently from the at least one parent interdependent transaction to increase throughput and decrease latency of the business process, the at least one independent transaction commits upon successful execution;
 - executing the child interdependent transactions independently from each other, the at least one parent interdependent transaction commits when a last child interdependent transaction commits; and
 - transferring committed data associated with the at least one independent transaction and the at least one parent interdependent transaction to a computer component for further processing.
2. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, the child interdependent transactions respectively include one or more actions, the one or more actions are concurrently executed independently from each other.
3. (Previously presented) The method of claim 2, respective child interdependent transactions commit when all of their associated actions are completed.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

4. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising explicitly defining transaction boundaries for the at least one independent transaction and the child interdependent transactions as a function of a number of actions within the at least one independent transaction and the child interdependent transactions, respectively, in order to define a granularity at an action level.

5. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, the child interdependent transactions are concurrently executed in isolation from each other.

6. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising employing separate machines to execute the at least one independent transaction and the at least one parent interdependent transaction.

7. (Currently amended) A system that uses an XML-based programming language for facilitating implementation of business processes within a computer-readable medium, the components comprising:

a user interface component; and

a plurality of model components accessible through the user interface component, the plurality of model components allows a user to create a model of a business process and reduce the model ~~via a SLANG~~ the XML-based programming language, the plurality of model components comprises a distinguishing model component that distinguishes between concurrent autonomous business operations and concurrent interdependent business operations.

8. (Previously presented) The system of claim 7, further comprising a transaction grouping component that groups business operations into concurrent interdependent transactions.

9. (Previously presented) The system of claim 8, the transaction grouping component provides synchronization of concurrent interdependent transactions based on completion of the concurrent interdependent transactions.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

10. (Previously presented) The system of claim 7, further comprising an action grouping component that groups business operations into concurrent interdependent actions.
11. (Previously presented) The system of claim 10, the action grouping component provides synchronization of concurrent interdependent actions based on completion of the concurrent interdependent actions.
12. (Previously presented) The system of claim 7, the plurality of components further comprising at least one boundary establishing component that defines transaction boundaries.
13. (Previously presented) The system of claim 12, the at least one boundary establishing component includes a component that establishes concurrent operations.
14. (Previously presented) The system of claim 12, the at least one boundary establishing component includes a component for establishing sequential operations.
15. (Previously presented) The system of claim 12, further comprising a compensation component that compensates committed interdependent concurrent transactions and is invoked upon the occurrence of a failed interdependent concurrent transaction.
16. (Previously presented) The system of claim 15, the interdependent concurrent transactions are children transactions in a parent transaction, wherein the compensation component is invoked by the parent transaction.
17. (Previously presented) The system of claim 15, the compensation component calls compensation routines within the committed interdependent concurrent transactions.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

18. (Previously presented) The system of claim 15, the compensation component calls compensation routines within the failed interdependent concurrent transaction.

19. (Previously presented) The system of claim 18, the compensation routines utilize information within the committed interdependent concurrent transactions.

20. (Previously presented) The system of claim 15, the compensation component calls compensation routines within the failed interdependent concurrent transaction based on information on the committed interdependent concurrent transactions stored within a database.

21. (Previously presented) The system of claim 13, the computer readable medium resides on a computer system.

22. (Previously presented) The system of claim 7, the plurality of components further comprising a component that defines concurrent synchronizing constraints as occurring upon completion of the autonomous operations.

23-27. (Cancelled).

28. (Currently amended) A system that uses a SLANG scheduling programming language for representing business comprising:

means for distinguishing between synchronization of autonomous concurrent operations from interdependent concurrent operations, the autonomous concurrent operations and the interdependent concurrent operations are represented in a SLANG the scheduling programming language, the scheduling programming language based on XML;

means for expressing synchronization constraints on completion of autonomous concurrent operations; and

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

means for allowing association of transaction operations and groups of business operations.

29. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising failing the at least one parent interdependent transaction when at least one of its child interdependent transactions does not commit, and compensating the at least one failed child transaction.

30. (Previously presented) The method of claim 29, the at least one parent interdependent transaction invokes a compensation routine within the at least one failed child transaction that compensates the at least one failed child transaction.

31. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising compensating the at least one independent transaction when at least one of the child interdependent transactions does not commit.

32. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising compensating the at least one parent interdependent transaction when it does not commit and all of its child interdependent transactions commit.

33. (Previously presented) The method of claim 32, the at least one parent interdependent transaction invokes its own compensation routine.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY